Case 3:15-cr-00041-CRB Document 46 Filed 01/23/15 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 15-041- CRB
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
WENDY STARK	
Defendant.	AL CARCUE 23 20
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on <u>January 23</u> , 2015, the Court excludes into surger the Speedy Trial Act from <u>January 23</u> , 2015 to <u>Ferrangery 18</u> , 2015 and finds that the ends of justice surged by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 USE COSTO 161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance woul See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	d be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	ex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact pect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial hed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	d deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	d unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	d unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 1/2/15	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney